



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/621,946	07/24/2000	Venkatachari Dilip	CSHE.P001	5253
53186	7590	03/04/2009		
COURTNEY STANIFORD & GREGORY LLP			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 9686			SUBRAMANIAN, NARAYANSWAMY	
SAN JOSE, CA 95157				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3695	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/04/2009 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/621,946

**Applicant(s)**

DILIP ET AL.

**Examiner**

Narayanswamy Subramanian

**Art Unit**

3695

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 59-64 and 78-83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 59-64 and 78-83 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/02)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to applicants' communications filed on July 2, 2008 and October 1, 2008. Amendments to claims 59 and 83, and cancellation of claims 65-67 have been entered. Claims 59-64 and 78-83 are pending in the application and have been examined. The rejections and response to arguments are stated below. Applicants are requested to note the Examiner's new art unit number (**AU 3695**) in their reply to this office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 59-64 and 78-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, claims 59 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not provide a written description disclosure to support the claimed limitations of "each financial institution is only participating automatically in the obtaining of account information available to it", "wherein recommending comprises generating a report for the account holder", "wherein recommending comprises generating a report for the account holder that is viewable on a computer via the publicly available network" and "wherein the one or more financial transactions involves one or more of the plurality of the financial institutions transacting with the financial management system and not transacting with each

other” (emphases added). Dependent claims are rejected by way of dependency on a rejected claim. Also claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not provide a written description disclosure to support the claimed limitation of “wherein recommending comprises displaying information on the client computer” (emphasis added).

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 59-64 and 78-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Independent claims 59 and 83 recite the limitation “wherein the financial management system is coupled to each of the financial institutions” (emphasis added). This limitation lacks antecedent basis. Also independent claim 59 recites the limitation “the financial management accessing each of the associated financial institutions”. It is not clear if the Applicants intended it to be “the financial management system accessing each of the associated financial institutions”. Dependent claims are rejected by way of dependency on a rejected independent claim. Appropriate correction is required. The art rejections are interpreted in light of the rejections above.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 59-64 and 78-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant et al. (US Patent 4,694,397).

Claims 59 and 83, Grant teaches a method and a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform a method comprising: a processor-based financial management system receiving identification and access information for a plurality of financial accounts from an account holder, wherein the identification information is entered by the account holder in a client computer and transmitted to the financial management system via a communications network according to standard protocols accessible to any user of the publicly available network (See the entire disclosure of Grant particularly Abstract, Figure 1, Column 3 lines 10-50, Column 5 lines 15-20, Networks provided by common carriers are interpreted to include publicly available network. A customer having dual status and a broker are interpreted to include an account holder. According to applicant's disclosure on page 7 lines 24-25 an account holder refers to any person having access to an account. Hence a customer having dual status and a broker are interpreted to include an account holder); the financial management system identifying a first account balance associated with a first account of the plurality of financial accounts (See the entire disclosure of Grant particularly Abstract, Column 3 lines 16-50 and Column 4 lines 3-26, brokerage and/or banking accounts imply plurality of financial accounts); the financial management system further identifying a second account balance associated with a second account of the plurality of financial accounts, wherein the wherein the first account and the second account are associated with one or more of

the plurality of financial institutions (See the entire disclosure of Grant particularly Abstract, Column 1 lines 11-18, Column 3 lines 16-50 and Column 5 line 35 - Column 6 line 10, banking and brokerage institutions are separate and independent, brokerage and/or banking accounts imply plurality of financial accounts); obtaining account information from the first and second accounts using the identification and access information provided by the account holder, wherein obtaining comprises comprising the financial management system accessing each of the associated financial institutions separately via the publicly available network such that each financial institution is only participating automatically in the obtaining of account information available to it; (See the entire disclosure of Grant particularly Figure 1, Abstract, Column 1 line 67- Column 2 line 7, Column 3 lines 10-50, Column 4 lines 5-25 and Column 5 line 35 - Column 6 line 10); the financial management system comparing the first account balance to a particular value; if the first account balance exceeds the particular value, the financial management system recommending a transfer of funds from the first account to the second account, wherein the first account and the second account have a common account holder, and wherein the recommendation to transfer funds identifies an amount to be transferred equal to the value by which the first account balance exceeds the particular value; and if the first account balance is below the particular value, the financial management system recommending a transfer of funds from the second account to the first account (See the entire disclosure of Grant particularly Figure 1, Abstract, Column 1 line 41- Column 2 line 43); the financial management system automatically executing one or more financial transactions on behalf of the account holder, comprising transferring funds to implement the recommendation, wherein the one or more financial transactions involves one or more of the plurality of the financial institutions

transacting with the financial management system and not transacting with each other (See the entire disclosure of Grant particularly Column 2 lines 14-42. As can be seen from Figure 1 the Banking database does not communicate directly with the brokerage database. The communication is only through the Banking/Brokerage interface). A computer-readable medium having stored thereon a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method is inherent in the disclosure.

Grant does not explicitly teach the features wherein identification and access information comprises account information, one or more online banking login names, and one or more passwords; and wherein recommending comprises generating a report for the account holder that is viewable on a computer via the publicly available network.

Official notice is taken that the features wherein identification and access information comprises account information, one or more online banking login names, and one or more passwords; and wherein recommending comprises generating a report for the account holder that is viewable on a computer via the publicly available network are old and well known. For instance identification and access information comprising account information, one or more online banking login names, and one or more passwords ensure that only authorized users can access the accounts thereby increasing the security and privacy of the accounts. Generating a report for the account holder that is viewable on a computer via the publicly available network makes the process more efficient and timely compared to a manual process.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include this feature to the invention of Grant. The combination of disclosures suggests that users would have benefited from the efficient and timely processing of transactions according

to the needs of the user. The users would have also benefited from the increased security and privacy of their accounts by having account information, one or more online banking login names, and one or more passwords.

Claims 60-64 and 78-82, Grant teaches the steps wherein obtaining account information and comparing the first account balance to a particular value is performed automatically at periodic intervals (See the entire disclosure of Grant particularly Column 3 lines 42-52); comparing the first account balance to a particular value includes applying at least one rule associated with the first account (See the entire disclosure of Grant particularly Column 2 lines 25-43); the first account is a checking account and the second account is a savings account (banking accounts imply these accounts); the second account pays a higher interest rate than the first account (old and well known); if the first account balance is below the particular value, the financial management system recommending a transfer of funds from the second account to the first account in an amount equal to the value by which the first account balance is below the particular value, wherein recommending comprises displaying information on the client computer (See the entire disclosure of Grant particularly Column 2 lines 25-43 and claim 3); the first account is a checking account and the second account is an investment account (inherent, banking account is a checking account and brokerage account is an investment account); the second account offers a better return than the first account (old and well known); the particular value is a minimum balance associated with the first account (See the entire disclosure of Grant particularly Column 2 lines 25-43); the particular value is a minimum required balance based on historical data (Old and well known); permitting the account holder to change the amount to be



transferred from the first account to the second account (See the entire disclosure of Grant particularly Column 4 lines 45-52, special handling is interpreted to include this feature).

***Response to Arguments***

6. In response to Applicant's arguments "Because of the networked nature of the system and the fact that the client computer is well known to communicate by displaying received information, it is implicit that recommending or offering (by the financial management system which is coupled to the client computer through the network) would comprise displaying information on the client computer.", the examiner respectfully disagrees. While it is clear the client computer communicates with the financial management system, the specification fails to clearly disclose the feature wherein recommending or offering, by the financial management system which is coupled to the client computer through the network, would comprise displaying information on the client computer. Hence rejections under 35 USC 112 are maintained by the examiner.

Applicant's other arguments with respect to pending claims 59-64 and 78-83 have been considered but are not persuasive.

***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Narayanswamy Subramanian whose telephone number is (571) 272-6751. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 8:30 AM to 7:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles R. Kyle can be reached at (571) 272-6746. The fax number for Formal or Official faxes and Draft to the Patent Office is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PMR only. For more information about the PMR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Narayanswamy Subramanian/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3695

March 2, 2009